



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/538,274

09/28/2006

Zhong-Min Wei

21829/222

9418

11951

7590

05/10/2011

LeClairRyan
290 Linden Oaks
Suite 310
Rochester, NY 14625

EXAMINER

PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/10/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,274	Applicant(s) WEI, ZHONG-MIN	
	Examiner ALTON PRYOR	Art Unit 1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 15, 24, 48-53, 104-111 and 120-135 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 24, 48, 51, 52, 104, 105, 107-111, 120-135 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 49, 50, 53, 106 and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 3/7/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See argument below. Previous rejections and other issues not addressed below are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8,49,50,53,106 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al (USPN 6001959) and Zitter et al. (WO 98/37752; 9/3/98), Wei et al. (USPN 6624139; 9/23/2003, see claims 1-9), Wei et al. (USPN 6235974; 5/22/01 see claims 1-11,15, 23-25,33 and 35), Qui et al. (USPN 6277814; 8/21/01, see column 25 lines 23-40, Examples 1, 11,12,13 and claims 1-10,14 and 17). Wei et al. (USPN 5776889; 7/7/98, see claims 1 and 23), Zitter et al. (USPN 5977060; 11/2/99 see claims 1 and 17), Wei et al. (USPN 5858324; 1/12/99, see column 6-8, column 19 line 62 – column 20), Wei et al. (USAN 2002/0059658; 5/16/02, column, abstract, paragraphs 17,18,22,24,46), Wei et al. (USPN 6960705; 11/1/05), see column 3 lines 25-57, column 4 line 50 – column 6, column 14 lines 37-49, column 18 lines 51-56, column 19 lines 32-37) and/or Fan et al. (USAN 2002/0062500; 5/23/02, see paragraphs 13,21,27-28,78,88).

Bauer et al. suggests that a hypersensitive response elicitor polypeptide derived from *Erwinia amylovora* along with an agricultural chemical can be applied to crop (transgenic) such as corn. Such combination of chemicals would automatically increase the efficacy of the agricultural chemicals. Bauer et al. does not teach herbicide as the pesticide. The numerous other cited references establish the ease of including herbicide as the agricultural. It would have been obvious to modify the invention taught by Bauer to include a herbicide suggested in the other references cited above.

Response to Applicant's argument

Applicant's major argument is that Bauer, Zitter I, Zitter II, Wei I, Qui I, Qui II, Wei II, Wei III, Wei IV, and Wei V do not teach or suggest a method of increasing the efficacy of agrochemical selected from pesticides, fertilizers comprising applying to plant or plant seed a hypersensitive response elicitor protein or polypeptide plus agrochemical. The Examiner maintains that each reference suggests that a hypersensitive response elicitor polypeptide with an agricultural chemical can be applied to crop (transgenic) such as corn. Such combination of chemicals would naturally increase the efficacy of the agricultural chemicals.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims

Art Unit: 1616

are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8,49,50,53,106 and 114 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. USPN 6277814; claims 1-10,14 and 17). Wei et al. (USPN 5776889; 7/7/98, see claims 1 and 23), Zitter et al. (USPN 5977060; 11/2/99 see claims 1 and 17), Wei et al. (USPN 5858324; 1/12/99, see claims. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because USPNs make claim to a

Art Unit: 1616

hypersensitive response elicitor polypeptide derived from *Erwinia amylovora* being combined with an agricultural chemical can be applied to crop (transgenic) such as corn. Such combination of chemicals would automatically increase the efficacy of the agricultural chemicals.

Claims 1-8,49,50,53,106 and 114 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of copending Application No. 12/536750. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because USPNs make claim to a hypersensitive response elicitor polypeptide derived from *Erwinia amylovora* being combined with an agricultural chemical can be applied to crop (transgenic) such as corn. Such combination of chemicals would automatically increase the efficacy of the agricultural chemicals.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Applicant's argument

Applicant's major argument is that Zitter II, Qui II, Wei II, Wei III, and USAN '750 do not teach or suggest a method of increasing the efficacy of agrochemical selected from pesticides, fertilizers comprising applying to plant or plant seed a hypersensitive response elicitor protein or polypeptide plus agrochemical. The Examiner maintains that each reference suggests that a hypersensitive response elicitor polypeptide with an agricultural chemical can be applied to crop (transgenic) such as corn. Such

Art Unit: 1616

combination of chemicals would naturally increase the efficacy of the agricultural chemicals.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALTON N. PRYOR whose telephone number is (571)272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alton N. Pryor/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616